



*Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC*

August 19, 2019

Via US Mail, Certified USPS Tracking No. 9407 1118 9956 1505 4222 36

Lee Rocha  
Environmental Manager  
Pabco Building Products, LLC  
675 Seaport Boulevard  
Redwood City, CA 94063

Via US Mail

Daniel S. Yanagihara Jr.  
Agent for service  
Pabco Building Products, LLC  
10600 White Rock Road, Suite 100  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**Re: 60-Day Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act")**

To Officers, Directors, Operators, Property Owners and/or Facility Managers of Pabco Building Products:

This letter is being sent to you on behalf of Eden Environmental Citizen's Group, LLC ("EDEN") to give legal notice that EDEN intends to file a civil action against Pabco Building Products, LLC ("Discharger" or "Pabco Building Products") for violations of the Federal Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that EDEN believes are occurring at the Pabco Building Products' facility located at 675 Seaport Boulevard in Redwood City, California ("the Facility" or "the site").

---

2151 Salvio Street #A2-319  
Telephone: 925-732-0960  
Website:

Concord, CA 94520



Email: [edenenvcitizens@gmail.com](mailto:edenenvcitizens@gmail.com)

**edenenvironmental.org**

EDEN is an environmental citizen's group established under the laws of the State of California to protect, enhance, and assist in the restoration of all rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries of California, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities.

EDEN formally registered as a limited liability company (LLC) association with the California Secretary of State on June 22, 2018; however, since at least July 1, 2014, EDEN has existed as an unincorporated environmental citizen's association with members who remain associated with EDEN as of the date of this Notice.

As discussed below, the Facility's discharges of pollutants degrade water quality and harm aquatic life in the Facility's Receiving Waters, which are waters of the United States and described in Section II.B, below. EDEN has members throughout California. Some of EDEN's members live, work, and/or recreate near the Receiving Waters and use and enjoy the Receiving Waters for surfing, kayaking, camping, fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, cycling, bird watching, picnicking, viewing wildlife, and/or engaging in scientific study.

At least one of EDEN's current members has standing to bring suit against Pabco Building Products, as the unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility as alleged herein has had an adverse effect particular to him or her and has resulted in actual harm to the specific EDEN member(s).

Further, the Facility's discharges of polluted storm water and non-storm water are ongoing and continuous. As a result, the interests of certain individual EDEN members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by the failure of Pabco Building Products to comply with the General Permit and the Clean Water Act.

CWA section 505(b) requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA section 505(a), a citizen must give notice of intent to file suit. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b). Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by CWA section 505(b), this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice to the Discharger of the violations which have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility. After the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit, EDEN intends to file suit in federal court against the Discharger under CWA section 505(a) for the violations described more fully below.

## **I. THE SPECIFIC STANDARD, LIMITATION, OR ORDER VIOLATED**

EDEN's investigation of the Facility has uncovered significant, ongoing, and continuous violations of the CWA and the General Industrial Storm Water Permit issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State Water Resources Control Board

(“SWRCB”)] Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ (“1997 Permit”) and by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ (“2015 Permit”) (collectively, the “General Permit”).

Information available to EDEN, including documents obtained from California EPA’s online Storm Water Multiple Application and Reporting Tracking System (“SMARTS”), indicates that on or around May 19, 2015, Pabco Building Products submitted a Notice of Intent (“NOI”) to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility under the 2015 Permit. Pabco Building Products’ assigned Waste Discharger Identification number (“WDID”) is 2 41I024973.

As more fully described in Section III, below, EDEN alleges that in its operations of the Facility, Pabco Building Products has committed ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act, California Water Code §13377; the General Permit, the Regional Water Board Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule (CTR) 40 C.F.R. § 131.38, and California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 64431.

## **II. THE LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS**

### **A. The Facility**

The location of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA is Pabco Building Products’ permanent facility address of 675 Seaport Boulevard in Redwood City, California.

Pabco Building Products Facility is an establishment engaged in the process of unloading, storing, and transferring of crushed Gypsum that is received from marine vessels. Facility operations are covered under Standard Industrial Classification Code (SIC) 4491- Marine Cargo Handling

Based on the EPA’s Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector Q – Water Transportation Facilities, polluted discharges from operations at the Facility potentially contain pH affecting substances; dust and debris; solvents, detergents; bacteria, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD); paint solids, heavy metals, ethylene glycol, total suspended solids (TSS), benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; and oil and grease. Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility’s industrial activities and associated materials are exposed to storm water, and that each of the substances listed on the EPA’s Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet is a potential source of pollutants at the Facility.

## **B. The Affected Receiving Waters**

The Facility discharges into a municipal storm drain system, which then discharges to the San Francisco Bay (“Receiving Waters”).

The San Francisco Bay is a water of the United States. The CWA requires that water bodies such as the San Francisco Bay meet water quality objectives that protect specific “beneficial uses.” The Regional Water Board has issued the *San Francisco Bay Basin Water Quality Control Plan* (“Basin Plan”) to delineate those water quality objectives.

The Basin Plan identifies the “Beneficial Uses” of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include: commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, fish migration, navigation, preservation of rare and endangered species, water contact and noncontact recreation, shellfish harvesting, fish spawning, and wildlife habitat. Contaminated storm water from the Facility adversely affects the water quality of the San Francisco Bay watershed and threatens the beneficial uses and ecosystem of this watershed.

Furthermore, the San Francisco Bay is listed for water quality impairment on the most recent 303(d)-list for the following: chlordane; dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT); dieldrin; dioxin compounds (including 2,3,7,8- tetrachlorodibenzo-pdioxin); furan compounds; invasive species; mercury; polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); PCBs (dioxin-like); selenium, and trash.

Polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from industrial facilities, such as the Facility, contribute to the further degradation of already impaired surface waters, and harm aquatic dependent wildlife.

## **III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND GENERAL PERMIT**

### **A. Deficient/Invalid SWPPP and Site Map**

Pabco Building Products’ current Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) and Site Map for the Facility are both inadequate and fail to comply with the requirements of the General Permit as specified in Section X of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, as follows:

- (a) The Site Map does not include the minimum required components for Site Maps as indicated in Section X.E of the General Permit. Specifically, the Site Map fails to include the following:

- 1) storm water drainage areas within the facility boundary and **portions of any drainage area impacted by discharges from surrounding areas;**

- 2) areas of soil erosion, if any;
  - 3) nearby water bodies such as rivers, lakes and creeks;
  - 4) locations of storm water collection and conveyance systems associated discharge locations and direction of flow;
  - 5) sample locations if different than the identified discharge locations;
  - 6) identification of all impervious areas of the facility, including paved areas, buildings, covered storage areas or other roofed structures;
  - 7) locations where materials are directly exposed to precipitation and the locations where identified significant spills or leaks have occurred;
  - 8) all areas of industrial activity subject to the General Permit.
- (b) The SWPPP fails to include a **BMP Summary Table** summarizing each identified area of industrial activity, the associated industrial pollutant sources, the industrial pollutants and the BMPs being implemented (Section X.H.4 and X.H.5);
- (c) The SWPPP fails to identify all **Non-Storm Water Discharges (NSWDs)** sources and drainage areas, including an evaluation of all drains (inlets and outlets) that identifies connections to the storm water conveyance system, and a description of how all unauthorized NSWDs have been eliminated (Section X.G.e)
- (d) The SWPPP fails to include an adequate discussion of the **Facility's receiving waters** (Section XI.B.6(e), Section X.G.2.ix);
- (e) The SWPPP fails to include in the SWPPP detailed information about its **Pollution Prevention Team** (Section X.D);

Failure to develop or implement an adequate SWPPP is a violation of Sections II.B.4.f and X of the General Permit.

***B. Failure to Develop, Implement and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the General Permit***

Section XI of the General Permit requires Dischargers to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting industrial activities. Dischargers have an ongoing obligation to revise the M&RP as necessary to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

The objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the General Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the Facility, and it must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

1. Failure to Conduct Visual Observations

Section XI(A) of the General Permit requires all Dischargers to conduct visual observations at least once each month, and sampling observations at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location.

Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges.

EDEN believes that between July 1, 2015, and the present, Pabco Building Products has failed to conduct monthly and sampling visual observations pursuant to Section XI(A) of the General Permit.

2. Failure to Collect and Analyze the Required Number of Storm Water Samples

EDEN alleges that Pabco Building Products has failed to provide the Regional Water Board with the minimum number of annual documented results of Facility run-off sampling as required under Sections XI.B.2 and XI.B.11.a of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, in violation of the General Permit and the CWA.

Section XI.B.2 of the General Permit requires that all Dischargers collect and analyze storm water samples from two Qualifying Storm Events ("QSEs") within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31), and two (2) QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

As of the date of this Notice, Pabco Building Products has failed to upload into the SMARTS database system *any* storm water sample analyses for samples collected during the reporting years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 to date.

**C. Falsification of Annual Reports Submitted to the Regional Water Board**

Section XXI.L of the General Permit provides as follows:

**L. Certification**

Any person signing, certifying, and submitting documents under Section XXI.K above shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all Attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information submitted is, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Further, Section XXI.N of the General Permit provides as follows:

**N. Penalties for Falsification of Reports**

Clean Water Act section 309(c)(4) provides that any person that knowingly makes any false material statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this General Permit, including reports of compliance or noncompliance shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years or by both.

On July 15, 2016, Pabco Building Products submitted its Annual Report for the Fiscal Years 2015-2016 Mr. Lee Rocha signed the Reports under penalty of law. Mr. Rocha is the current Legally Responsible Person ("LRP") for Pabco Building Products.

Mr. Rocha "Yes" to Question No. 3 on the Annual Report(s) ("Did you sample the required number of Qualifying Storm Events during the reporting year for all discharge locations, in accordance with Section XI.B?") However, as discussed above, Pabco Building Products failed to collect and analyze the required number of storm water samples during the reporting year in question.

**D. Late-Filed Annual Report/Failure to File Annual Reports**

Pabco Building Products has failed to comply with Section XVI.A of the General Permit, which provides as follows: "The Discharger shall certify and submit via SMARTS an Annual

Report no later than July 15th following each reporting year using the standardized format and checklists in SMARTS.”

Pabco Building Products’ Annual Report for the reporting year 2016-17 was due on or before July 15, 2017. However, the Facility failed to file the Annual Report until July 2, 2018.

**E. Deficient BMP Implementation**

Sections I.C, V.A and X.C.1.b of the General Permit require Dischargers to identify and implement minimum and advanced Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) that comply with the Best Available Technology (“BAT”) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (“BCT”) requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in their storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability.

EDEN alleges that Pabco Building Products has been conducting industrial activities at the site without adequate BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the General Permit, and thus are always prohibited.

Pabco Building Products’ failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

**Specific BMP Deficiencies**

A view of a Google Street View image dated March 2018, shows a large puddle accumulated towards the southwesterly edge of the site outside the Berm Wall. In addition to the Google Street View image, there is further evidence of repeated occurrences in the same area from Google Earth satellite images dated November 2016, May 2017, and May 2018. This occurrence would be considered a discharge from the Facility capable of sample collection and analyzation. This puddled area is a concern of Eden due to the fact that in a heavy storm event, pollutants can travel along the curb and enter the nearby storm drain which is located just before the railroad crossing on Herkner Road.

**F. Discharges in Violation of the General Permit**

Except as authorized by Special Conditions of the General Permit, Discharge Prohibition III(B) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit.



Information available to EDEN indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges.

EDEN alleges that the Discharger has discharged storm water containing excessive levels of pollutants from the Facility to its Receiving Waters during at least every significant local rain event over 0.1 inches in the last five (5) years.

EDEN hereby puts the Discharger on notice that each time the Facility discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition III.B of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

**G. Failure to Comply with Facility SWPPP**

Section 4 “Stormwater Sampling and Reporting” of the Facility SWPPP indicates that the Facility will collect and analyze storm water samples from two qualified storm events within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31) and two QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

As detailed above, the Facility missed collecting storm water samples in the reporting years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19.

**H. Failure to Properly Train Employees/Facility Pollution Prevention Team**

Section X.D.1 of the General Permit requires each Facility to establish a Pollution Prevention Team responsible for assisting with the implementation of the requirements of the General Permit. The Facility is also required to identify alternate team members to implement the SWPPP and conduct required monitoring when the regularly assigned Pollution Prevention Team members are temporarily unavailable (due to vacation, illness, out of town business, or other absences).

Section X.H.f of the General Permit also requires that each Facility ensure that all Pollution Prevention Team members implementing the various compliance activities of the General Permit are properly trained in at least the following minimum requirements: BMP implementation, BMP effectiveness evaluations, visual observations, and monitoring activities. Further, if a Facility enters Level 1 status, appropriate team members must be trained by a QISP.

Based on the foregoing violations, it is clear that Pabco Building Products has either not properly established its Pollution Prevention Team, or has not adequately trained its Pollution Prevention Team, in violation of Sections X.D.1 and X.H.f of the General Permit.

Pabco Building Products may have had other violations that can only be fully identified and documented once discovery and investigation have been completed. Hence, to the extent

possible, EDEN includes such violations in this Notice and reserves the right to amend this Notice, if necessary, to include such further violations in future legal proceedings.

#### **IV. THE PERSON OR PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLATIONS**

The entities responsible for the alleged violations are Pabco Building Products, as well as employees of the Facility responsible for compliance with the CWA.

#### **V. THE DATE, DATES, OR REASONABLE RANGE OF DATES OF THE VIOLATIONS**

The range of dates covered by this 60-day Notice is from at least July 1, 2014, to the date of this Notice. EDEN may from time to time update this Notice to include all violations which may occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature; therefore, each day constitutes a violation.

#### **VI. CONTACT INFORMATION**

The entity giving this 60-day Notice is Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN").

Aiden Sanchez  
EDEN ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZEN'S GROUP  
2151 Salvio Street #A2-319  
Concord, CA 94520  
Telephone: (925) 732-0960  
Email: [Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com](mailto:Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com) (emailed correspondence is preferred)  
Website: [edenenvironmental.org](http://edenenvironmental.org)

EDEN has retained counsel in this matter as follows:

CRAIG A. BRANDT  
Attorney at Law  
5354 James Avenue  
Oakland CA, 94618  
Telephone: (510) 601-1309  
Email: [craigabrandt@att.net](mailto:craigabrandt@att.net)

To ensure proper response to this Notice, all communications should be addressed to EDEN's legal counsel, Mr. Craig A. Brandt.

## **VII. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT**

CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any “person,” including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), §1362(5).

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five (5) years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. **These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009, and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.**

In addition to civil penalties, EDEN will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

**Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d) and California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, EDEN will seek to recover its pre and post-litigation costs, including all attorneys’ and experts’ fees and costs incurred** (see *Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2017) 853 F.3d 1076; *Vasquez v. State of California* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 243).

## **VIII. CONCLUSION**

The CWA specifically provides a 60-day notice period to promote resolution of disputes. EDEN encourages Pabco Building Products’ counsel to contact **EDEN’s counsel** within 20 days of receipt of this Notice to initiate a discussion regarding the violations detailed herein. Please do not contact EDEN directly.

During the 60-day notice period, EDEN is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations; however, if Pabco Building Products wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. EDEN reserves the right to file a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Aiden Sanchez', with a stylized loop at the end.

AIDEN SANCHEZ  
Managing Member  
Eden Environmental Citizen's Group  
QISP #00998

Copies to:

Andrew Wheeler: [wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov](mailto:wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov)  
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection  
Agency

State Water Resources Control Board  
Eileen Sobeck, Executive Director  
[eileen.sobeck@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:eileen.sobeck@waterboards.ca.gov)

Mayumi Okamoto, Office of Enforcement:  
[Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov)  
[stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov)

Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA – Region 9  
Jennifer Pierce: [pierce.jennifer@epa.gov](mailto:pierce.jennifer@epa.gov)  
Laurie Kermish: [kermish.Laurie@epa.gov](mailto:kermish.Laurie@epa.gov)